REMARKS

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview on November 13, 2003. Claims 1-26 are pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments, reconsideration and allowance of all the rejected claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Claim 8 has been amended to provide antecedent basis. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully sought.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 12, 14-18, 20-21 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by "Cascading Style Sheets in Internet Explorer 4.0 and Examples" by George Young (Young). Claims 9-10 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Young. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections on the following basis.

Independent claims 1, 16, 20, and 23 have been amended to recite, among other things, that the structure information defines an arrangement of the at least two independently formattable regions within a frameset.

9

In an exemplary embodiment, the system may provide the source for the frameset in the same document management file as the frame structure (*See* page 3, lines 17-19 and Fig. 2-3 of specification).

Young is directed to Cascading Style Sheets (CSS), which is a standard of formatting Web pages (*See* Young page 2, Introduction). With CSS, Web developers are provided with formatting options (*See* Young page 2, Introduction). The Examiner relies on Young for disclosing "storing structure information for two independently formattable regions" (*See* page 3, paragraph number 8 of the Office Action of September 10, 2003). The Examiner maintains that "in the cited example (p. 7, 'Choosing') there are two <p> tags" and that "this is structure information" (*See* page 8, paragraph number 13 of the Office Action of September 10, 2003). However, this portion of Young discloses structure information for the content of the information and not for the independently formattable regions within a frameset arrangement. In fact, Young does not even address framesets. As a result, Young is deficient because it fails to teach or suggest that the structure information defines an arrangement of the regions within a frameset.

In view of the foregoing differences between independent claims 1, 16, 20, and 23 and the cited prior art, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 16, 20, and 23 are allowable. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, and 25 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency. Thus, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are requested.

Claims 13, 19, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Young in view of Fields et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,655). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Claims 13, 19, and 26 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 13, and 23, respectively, and therefore include the feature that the structure information defines an arrangement of the at least two independently formattable regions within a frameset, among other things. As discussed above, Young fails to teach or suggest this feature. The Examiner further acknowledges that Young is deficient because it does not disclose translating the electronic document into a plurality of HTML documents and relies on Fields for disclosing this feature (*See* page 7, paragraph number 11 of the Office Action of September 10, 2003). Fields discloses a method of reusing content from a variety of other content providers and adapting the content to the appearance of the hosting web site so that the content from the plurality of web sites appears native to the hosting web site (*See* Fields column 2, lines 44-50).

Even if Fields does teach translating the electronic document into a plurality of HTML documents; Young and Fields both alone and in combination are still deficient, because they do not teach or suggest structure information that defines an arrangement of the at least two independently formattable regions within a frameset.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Young in view of Netscape Screenshot (©1997). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Claim 7 depends indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore includes the feature that the structure information defines an arrangement of the at least two independently formattable regions within a frameset, among other things. As discussed above, Young fails to teach or suggest this feature. The Examiner further acknowledges that Young is deficient because it does not disclose email, and relies on the Netscape screenshot for disclosing this feature (*See* page 7, paragraph number 12 of the Office Action of September 10, 2003).

Even if the Netscape screenshot discloses an email header and footer; Young and the Netscape screenshot both alone and in combination are still deficient, because they do not teach or suggest structure information that defines an arrangement of the at least two independently formattable regions within a frameset.

In view of the foregoing differences between independent claims 1, 16, 20, and 23, and the cited prior art, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Thus claims 1, 16, 20, and 23 are believed to be allowable and dependent claims 2-15, 17-19, 21, 22, and 24-26 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the Office

Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the

Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at

the number provided.

Dated: November 26, 2003   Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 29315

Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO P.C.
12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
703-464-8140

RES 104126v1

13